



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/619,219	07/19/2000	Steven R. Bard	INTL-0417-US (P9042)	1192

7590

07/31/2002

Timothy N Trop
Trop Pruner & Hu PC
8554 Katy Freeway Suite 100
Houston, TX 77024

EXAMINER

BARBEE, MANUEL L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2857

DATE MAILED: 07/31/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/619,219	Applicant(s) BARD, STEVEN R.	
	Examiner Manuel L. Barbee	Art Unit 2857	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 July 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
 * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:
On page 4, line 13, "16" should be --16c--.
Appropriate correction is required.
2. Claim 24 is objected to because of the following informalities: In claim 24, line 3 of the claim, --that-- should be inserted after "device". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-3, 5-13 and 15-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Oprescu et al. (US Patent No. 5,842,027).

With regard to detecting a power sink coupled to a power source, as shown in claims 1 and 11, Oprescu et al teach determining what components are connected to a bus with a power manager at initialization (col. 5, lines 25-42; col. 7, lines 17-54; Figure 1, power manager 50, power line 30, bus 12). With regard to sending a data signal between the source and the sink to determine whether the source can power the sink, as shown in claims 1 and 11, Oprescu et al. teach sending the power requirements of

Art Unit: 2857

all components attached to the bus to the power manager (col. 6, lines 27-41; col. 7, line 11 - col. 8, line 65).

With regard to coupling a plurality of power sinks to the power source, as shown in claims 2 and 12, Oprescu et al. teach coupling more than one power sink to the bus (col. 5, lines 1-15). With regard to receiving a self-identifier packet at the source from the sink, as shown in claims 3 and 13, Oprescu teaches sending identifying information from all components connected to the bus to the power manager at initialization and sending identifying information and state information when power is requested (col. 7, lines 18-33; Figure 2, step 100). With regard to receiving power class information from the sink, as shown in claims 5 and 15, Oprescu teaches receiving identifying information and state information when power is requested at the power manager so that the power requirements can be found in the power table created at initialization (col. 7, lines 55-67).

With regard to determining the available power of the source, as shown in claims 6 and 16, Oprescu et al. teach finding the sum of power being used and determining the surplus power (col. 8, lines 1-19; Figure 2, step 104). With regard to determining whether to supply power, as shown in claims 7 and 17, Oprescu et al. teach comparing the surplus power with the power requirements of an additional component to determine whether to supply power to the component (col. 8, lines 20-65). With regard to supplying power for enumeration to the sink whether the source is able supply power to the sink or not, as shown in claims 8, 9, 18 and 19, Oprescu teaches initializing all components in a local database at startup (col. 7, lines 34-54). With regard to sending

Art Unit: 2857

an identifier to the source to determine whether the source can supply power to the sink, as shown in claims 10 and 20, Oprescu teaches sending identifying information and using this to look up power requirements of components on the bus (col. 7, lines 18-33, 55-67).

With regard to a connection to a power source, a plurality of ports to couple power consuming devices, and a processor-based device to determine whether to supply power to the devices, as shown in claims 21 and 24, Oprescu et al. teach a power line and a power manager both connected to a bus that is connected to power consuming devices (col. 8, lines 25-42; Figure 1, power manager 50; bus 12, power line 30; col. 5, lines 1-52). With regard to a fan out physical layer, as shown in claim 22, Oprescu et al. teach a fan out physical layer; col. 9, lines 34-55; Figure 3). With regard to an AC adapter, as shown in claim 23, Oprescu et al. teach an AC adapter (col. 4, lines 57-67; Figure 1, AC adapter 34). With regard to providing power for enumeration and then determining whether to provide further power, Oprescu et al. teach identifying all components and adding them to a local database before determining whether to provide power in response to power requests (col. 6, line 27 - col. 7, line 67).

With regard to power consuming circuitry, a processor-based device, and a port connected to receive power from and exchange data with the power source, as shown in claim 26, Oprescu teaches power consuming devices connected to a bus and a power manager (col. 8, lines 25-42; Figure 1, power manager 50, power line 30; bus 12; col. 5, lines 1-15; col. 5, line 53 - col. 6, line 4). With regard to the system being a mobile computer, as shown in claim 27, Oprescu et al. teach that the system could be a

Art Unit: 2857

portable computer or a laptop (col. 1, lines 34-49). With regard to a physical layer integrated with a link layer, as shown in claim 28, and a data plug, as shown in claim 29, Oprescu et al. teach a physical layer with a linked layer (col. 9, lines 34-55). With regard to the processor based device generating a self-ID packet that indicates the power needs of the system, as shown in claim 30, Oprescu et al. teach that the power manager receives the power needs of all components attached to the bus at initialization (col. 7, lines 34-67).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 4 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oprescu et al.

Oprescu et al. teach all the limitations of claims 1 and 11 upon which claims 4 and 14 depend, respectively. Oprescu et al. do not teach requesting a power class indication from the sinks. The Examiner takes official notice that it is well known to request data from other components on a bus. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the power manager, as taught by Oprescu et al. to include requesting power class information, because then the power manager would control the time when data is received and avoid receiving information from two components simultaneously.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Pintar (US Patent No. 4,970,623) teaches peripheral device power activation.

Allen (US Patent No. 5,649,210) teaches network connection detection capability and determining if the voltage level is valid for power.

Richman et al. (US Patent No. 5,655,148) teach automatically configuring devices on a network.

Tokano (US Patent No. 5,838,577) teaches an electrical apparatus capable of being connected to plural kinds of peripheral devices.

Saito et al. (US Patent No. 6,301,674) teaches a power control method.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Manuel L. Barbee whose telephone number is 703-308-0979. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marc S. Hoff can be reached on 703-308-1677. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-7722 for regular communications and 703-308-7722 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-0976.

Application/Control Number: 09/619,219

Page 7

Art Unit: 2857

mlb

July 16, 2002



MARC S. HOFF
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800